



---

# Servant Leadership's Contribution to Organizational Culture-Mediated Job-Related Outcomes and Leader-Related Outcomes

Willem Naa<sup>a</sup>, Farida Jasfar<sup>a</sup>, Lucy Warsindah<sup>a</sup> and Robert Kristaung<sup>a\*</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Faculty of Economics and Business, Universitas Trisakti, Jakarta, Indonesia.

## Authors' contributions

*This work was carried out in collaboration among all authors. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.*

## Article Information

DOI: 10.9734/JEMT/2022/v28i111053

## Open Peer Review History:

This journal follows the Advanced Open Peer Review policy. Identity of the Reviewers, Editor(s) and additional Reviewers, peer review comments, different versions of the manuscript, comments of the editors, etc are available here: <https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/91253>

Original Research Article

Received 27 July 2022

Accepted 02 October 2022

Published 10 October 2022

---

## ABSTRACT

**Aims:** The purpose of this study is to examine the impact of servant Leadership on psychological empowerment, organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behavior, job satisfaction, and leader effectiveness with organizational culture as moderation of third-echelon officials in the Mimika District Government of Papua Province, Indonesia.

**Study Design:** The study design of this research is a hypothesis-testing with non-probability sampling.

**Place and Duration of Study:** 120 respondents from November 2021 to January 2022.

**Methodology:** Partial Least Square with Structural Equation Modeling.

**Results:** The results of this study are Servant Leadership has a positive and significant effect on four job-related outcomes, namely psychological empowerment; organizational commitment; organizational citizenship behavior, and job satisfaction. Meanwhile, corporate culture only significantly modifies the relationship between Servant Leadership, organizational citizenship behavior, and job satisfaction.

**Conclusion:** The practical implications of the research are that the most robust dimensions of servant leadership are listening, persuasion, visionary and capable. For organizational culture, the dimensions of Uncertainty avoidance, especially those related to complex monitoring systems, need to be simplified. And for the psychological empowerment variable, third echelon officials expect self-determination to choose to initiate and manage actions as leaders.

*Keywords: Servant leadership; psychological empowerment; organizational commitment; organizational citizenship behavior; job satisfaction; leader effectiveness.*

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Servant leadership prioritizes the needs, interests, and aspirations of the people they lead above themselves [1]. At this level, echelon III officials are usually those who directly deal with customers and stakeholders and must be able to provide excellent service to ensure customer satisfaction [2].

The idealism of servant leadership is that the servant leader has high morality and suppresses his ego by prioritizing the needs and interests of his followers or subordinates [2-4]. Various leadership measurements have been a concern of researchers [4], generally multidimensional [5].

The multi-dimensional side of servant leadership aims to motivate employees to improve their work performance [6-8]. Increase employee job involvement [9], trust in leaders [10], service performance and organizational citizenship behavior [4], and service climate [11].

Servant leadership theoretically received considerable attention from experts but was limited in terms of narrative review [5] and limited retrospective analysis [12]. A meta-analytic study by [13] succeeded in comparing three forms of leadership. One of the recommendations is that more research is conducted to conduct meta-analysis and empirical research on servant leadership to gain a more substantial theoretical basis. It is necessary to consider social exchange theory [2] in empirical studies related to servant leadership in various organizational forms.

Researchers have paid increasing attention to discussing how servant leaders motivate employees to improve their work attitudes and performance [6-8]. Empirical research on servant leadership has mainly focused on employee job engagement [9], trust in leaders [14], service performance and organizational citizenship behavior [4,12], service climate [6], group service performance, and group OCB [15]. Moreover, although most of the research on Servant Leaders is based in Western Contexts [5], more research is interested in Asia [7,16]. The cultural impact of servant leadership and have indicated that servant leadership can be implemented differently in collectivistic and power distance cultural contexts [17]. Therefore, scholars have

called for more research to verify the cultural features in studies of servant leadership [18].

Finally, this study introduces a cultural perspective to interpret the effectiveness of servant leadership in public organizations. Most of the previous empirical research has focused on examining servant leadership as it impacts the performance outcomes of employees or groups of employees in general. Of course, without ignoring cultural values, especially public organizations which are very different from other service industries that have a profit orientation [19].

Servant leadership positively influences job satisfaction, but it is not significant with employee performance related to OCB [20]. But for, employee motivation has a moderating function on servant leadership and job outcomes. Especially for employees with a strong impression of management, job satisfaction is low. So, they state that servant leadership is not always beneficial for all subordinates.

The need to improve organizational capabilities can be done with organizational citizenship behavior [21]. Job satisfaction and organizational commitment are essential parts of influencing OCB. Their study shows direct and indirect effects between job satisfaction and OCB, but organizational commitment also has a mediating function. Organizational commitment contributes as a mediator between job satisfaction and OCB. They conducted an in-depth study of servant leadership using a meta-analysis, which was still limited to the relationship between servant leadership and outcomes in the service industry context [22].

After identifying the ideal leadership characteristics as described above, the researcher felt compelled to explore and explore leadership practices in the Papua district because Presidential Instruction (Inpres) No. 9 of 2020 concerning the Acceleration of Welfare Development in Papua and West Papua became the foundation of the government's commitment to resolving the root cause of the problem. The Papuan people experience them. "A comprehensive strategy for Papua has been carried out from various perspectives since the era of special autonomy in 2001, both adopted by the central government and regional

governments. Some steps in the grand design have been made for Papua and West Papua. Significant changes are reflected in the decrease in the percentage of the poor, from 54.75 percent in March 1999 to 26.55 percent in September 2019.

This research on servant leaders is certainly not the only one that has ever been done. Novelty in this research argues that the same leadership practice in other places may have similarities with what the Papuan Regency Government practices. The added value of this research is that the servant leadership model is run by the regional head and the head of the Papua Regency office. Thus, the study based on Mimika's local wisdom can be a model or guide for the practice of leaders serving in other districts/cities in Papua. Papua must stand on par with other regions in Indonesia regarding leadership qualities to influence people to have a quality way of life and living.

### 1.1 Hypothesis Development

Servant leadership has been empirically tested for its relationship with work motivation and organizational engagement [19,20,23], which essentially looks at its impact on employee work attitudes. Therefore, in social exchange, this method can motivate employees, increasing service leadership's effectiveness. Therefore, employees will understand that the interpersonal relationships built by their leaders will help the needs, desires, and future of employees [15,24]. Employees will view their leaders as helpful (support) in their careers and foster high motivation when this is fulfilled. So servant leadership positively affects employee empowerment [3].

#### **Hypothesis 1: Servant leaders have a positive effect on the level of individual psychological empowerment**

Servant leadership can be efficient in organizational functions because it can maintain high employee trust. Servant leadership shows genuine consideration for employees, which increases employee engagement and cohesiveness in organizational processes [17]. Servant leadership also promotes organizational values and norms, increasing employee commitment to the organization [12]. This commitment is inseparable from the positive image of the organization in the eyes of employees. Thus, servant leadership can raise

employees' collective awareness of work commitment. Therefore, it forms a high social identification with the organization [2].

#### **Hypothesis 2: Servant leaders have a positive effect on organizational commitment**

Servant leadership creates a social context that supports employees with prosocial behavior in a conducive work environment, such as interpersonally and organizationally directed OCB [25]. Servant leadership encourages employees to express diverse ideas and adopt innovative ways of carrying out their duties [4]. Servant leadership encourages employees to develop a strong attitude in identifying relationships with leaders and provides a strong sense of security so that employees are more willing to take risks and adopt new ideas and strive to make them happen [26].

#### **Hypothesis 3: Servant leaders have a positive effect on OCB**

The initial model of servant leadership was to feature leaders who gave genuine concern and support to employees [4]. That is, when the serving leader is sensitive to employee needs, effectively provides tangible assets, and helps improve employee well-being. Previous research has considered that perceived organizational support as an organization that cares about employee welfare [27] will result in employees who feel supported at work and are satisfied with their current job. This is an essential matter concerning employee welfare [16]. Servant leadership prioritizes the needs and satisfaction of its subordinates as long as it is by organizational policies and procedures [4]. Employees who feel supported will be more satisfied with their work.

#### **Hypothesis 4: Servant leadership has a positive effect on job satisfaction**

As mentioned earlier, servant leadership effectively generates high-quality exchanges between a leader and employees in the workplace. According to [28], social exchange theory is a fundamental relationship-based approach to understanding the relational dynamics between servant leaders and employees. One distinct feature of servant leadership in organizations is that leaders appear friendly and approachable when interacting with employees [7].

#### **Hypothesis 5: Servant leaders are positively related to leadership effectiveness**

Servant leadership integrates participatory management, team solidity, totality, and service orientation [29]. Servant leadership is built on ethical, moral, and empowering values and focuses on the importance of respect. The empowerment process aims to develop a proactive and self-confident attitude and give a sense of personal power [12]. This sense of control is practically transmitted to followers by Servant leadership. Servant leadership behavior does not increase members' individual competence and skill level but rather strengthens their perceptions due to their subjective evaluation of the organizational environment [30], including the intrinsic motives of employee experience [30].

Several studies have discussed empowerment as one of the most critical dimensions of Servant leadership [31]. Although the existence of various studies directly shows the effect of Servant leadership on the psychological environment [27,32–34], also several studies examine the mediating role psychological environment in terms of the effect of Servant leadership on organizations [12,35]. The followers' perceptions of being empowered were positively related to Servant leadership behavior [32,27] found that underestimation was the most vital determinant in the context of the servant leader effect on the psychological environment. Also found that SL empowerment creates additional differences in the psychological climate and is the most critical dimension in OC [12].

Along with limited studies that directly discuss the effects of Servant leadership on Organizational culture, several studies discuss the mediating or moderating role of Organizational culture between the relationship with Servant leadership and some organizational behaviors such as employee behavior [36]. In addition, the association of certain variables that are influenced by Servant leadership (job commitment and additional roles) with organizational culture is also discussed in the literature [37].

#### **Hypothesis 6: Organizational culture moderates servant leadership in the psychological environment**

The behavior of task-oriented, relationship-oriented, and change-oriented leaders has a positive influence on organizational commitment and obtained the formula that employees are interested in responding to relationships and leaders who have a transformation orientation

[38]. Leadership has been considered very important in many fields and organizations when it comes to organizational commitment [39]. Leadership style serves as an influence on organizational commitment. Leaders are role models for employees; when employees see leaders in informal conditions and can see the leader's good intentions, this will influence employees to be more oriented towards the common good [40].

#### **Hypothesis 7: Organizational culture moderates servant leadership on organizational commitment**

Task-oriented, relationship-oriented, and change-oriented leaders positively influence organizational citizenship behavior [38]. Leaders are role models for employees; when employees see leaders in informal conditions and see the leader's good intentions, this will influence employees to be more oriented towards the common good [40]. Servant leadership has a positive relationship with organizational citizenship behavior [35].

#### **Hypothesis 8: Organizational culture moderates servant leadership on organizational citizenship behavior**

Servant leadership is related to job satisfaction mediated by Leader-Member Exchange [34]. Furthermore, [41] stated that servant leadership has a relationship with job satisfaction. Then servant leadership has a positive and significant relationship with employee loyalty [42]. State that there is a positive effect of compensation, empowerment, and job satisfaction on employee loyalty and a positive influence on balance and empowerment [43]. Then according to [44], job satisfaction significantly impacts dedication and commitment, and servant leadership affects job satisfaction.

#### **Hypothesis 9: Organizational culture moderates servant leadership on job satisfaction**

An innovative work attitude is recognized as part of effective leadership. Creative work attitudes also result in new knowledge, skills, and technologies [45]. Argues to get innovation, an employee must be able to have various skills and understand creative innovation. Servant leadership will motivate employees to do self-development, desire to develop cognitive abilities, and have more creative ideas. This is in line with several previous research findings that

servant leadership is related to leader effectiveness [46-48]. In research on servant leadership, the results show that it can motivate subordinates and increase leader effectiveness [49].

**Hypothesis 10: Organizational culture moderates servant leadership on leader effectiveness**

**2. METHODS**

Data collection in this study was carried out by distributing questionnaires to third echelon officials in Mimika district, Papua province, with the results of 120 questionnaires that were feasible to be processed. The data collection period is from November 2021 to January 2022 from various offices, agencies, and sections of the Mimika district government.

The results of the instrument test are 19 indicators of the Servant leadership variable, eight hands of the organizational culture variable, eight indicators of the psychological empowerment variable, six indicators of the corporate commitment variable, ten indicators of the managerial citizenship behavior variable, ten hands of the job satisfaction variable which has a correlation coefficient value. With a probability value less than 0.05, it can be stated that all indicators of these variables meet the criteria as valid research instruments.

Table 1 shows that all variables indicate that Cronbach's Alpha is more significant than 0.6, so it is stated as reliable.

Based on the value of outer loading shows, SL10 serves SL14 careful planning OC2 complex OC3 show off PE2 work requirements PE7 work strategy PE7 work strategy has a value of more than 0.6 valid.

Based on Table 2 showed all of the variables are reliable, with a Cronbach alpha of more than 0.6.

**3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

**3.1 Results**

Sampling was done using a non-probability sample. The characteristics of 120 respondents, in summary, from the majority's perspective, are men, with a total of 18 people (56.7%). Of the most ages, 56 people, or 46.7%, are 41-50 years old. The most education is S1 or equivalent, as many as 73 people or 60.8%, while the length of work is between 12 to 20 years, as many as 54 people or 45%. For services, the number is relatively well distributed between 4 to 6 echelon officials from the service up to the body. Finally, the number of subordinates led by third echelon officials is more than 21 (78.3%).

**3.2 Discussion**

The first hypothesis showed that servant leaders have a positive effect on the level of individual psychological empowerment. This result supported by [3,9,15,20,23,24,27,50].

The second hypothesis showed that servant leadership has a positive effect on organizational commitment. The characteristic of leaders must be able to listen to others to increase organizational commitment [2,3,17].

The third hypothesis showed that servant leaders have a positive effect on OCB. The higher servant leadership will increase the OCB. Leaders must listen to others. Servant leaders try to convince others rather than forcing compliance, and leaders carefully plan anticipatory organizational steps in the future [4,25,26].

The fourth hypothesis showed that servant leadership positively affects job satisfaction. The servant leader tries to convince others rather than forcing obedience. So, it will increase job satisfaction [16,51].

**Table 1. Reliability test**

Variable	Numberof Items	Cronbach'sAlpha	Result
<i>Servant Leadership</i>	10	.758	Reliable
<i>Leadershiponal culture</i>	8	.603	Reliable
<i>Psychological empowerment</i>	8	.686	Reliable
<i>Organizational commitment</i>	6	.584	Reliable
<i>Organizational citizenship behavior</i>	10	.660	Reliable
<i>Job satisfaction</i>	10	.750	Reliable
<i>Leadership effectiveness</i>	10	.758	Reliable

**Table 2. Quality criteria**

<b>Variable</b>	<b>AVE</b>	<b>Composite Reliability</b>	<b>R-Square</b>	<b>Cronbach Alpha</b>
<i>Psychological Empowerment</i>				
OC	0.782	0.877	0.296	0.732
PE	0.563	0.794		0.616
SL	0.849	0.919		0.825
SL*OC	0.649	0.880		0.823
<i>Organizational Commitment</i>				
OC	0.623	0.768	0.398	0.695
OCM	0.689	0.867		0.766
SL	1.000	1.000		1.000
SL*OC	0.416	0.192		0.656
<i>Organizational Citizenship Behavior</i>				
OC	0.591	0.812	0.435	0.668
OCB	0.620	0.830		0.695
SL	0.646	0.842		0.716
SL*OC	0.576	0.924		0.910
<i>Job Satisfaction</i>				
JS	0.622	0.868	0.321	0.798
OC	1.000	1.000		1.000
SL	0.665	0.772		0.675
SL*OC	0.542	0.815		0.712
LE	0.652	0.827	0.314	0.721
OC	0.637	0.686		0.660
SL	1.000	1.000		1.000
SL*OC	0.608	0.671		0.628

**Table 3. Path coefficients (Mean, STDEV, T-Values)**

<b>Hypothesis</b>	<b>Original Sample</b>	<b>T-Statistics</b>	<b>Decision</b>
H1: Servant leaders have a positive effect on the level of individual psychological empowerment	0.239	3.126	Supported
H2: Servant leaders have a positive effect on organizational commitment	0.221	2.437	Supported
H3: Servant leaders have a positive effect on OCB	0.192	2.356	Supported
H4: Servant leadership has a positive effect on job satisfaction	0.357	3.211	Supported
H5: Servant leaders are positively related to leadership effectiveness.	0.017	0.170	Not Supported
H6: Organizational culture moderates servant leadership in the psychological environment	-0.021	0.131	Not Supported
H7: Organizational culture moderates servant leadership on organizational commitment	0.019	0.190	Not Supported
H8: Organizational culture moderates servant leadership on organizational citizenship behavior	0.148	2.891	Supported
H9: Organizational culture moderates servant leadership on job satisfaction	0.229	2.084	Supported
H10: Organizational culture moderates servant leadership on leader effectiveness	-0.198	1.243	Not Supported

The fifth hypothesis showed that servant leadership does not affect leadership effectiveness. The leader must be able to listen to others with complete sincerity and will not be able to support leadership effectiveness.

The sixth hypothesis showed that organizational culture doesn't moderate servant leadership in the psychological environment. Organizational culture is only a predictor of moderation. The organization has a complex monitoring system that is carried out carefully, and the dominant values of the organization are to show off, perform, achieve, and make money; it will not moderate the influence of servant leadership on Psychological Empowerment.

The seven-hypothesis showed that organizational culture doesn't moderate servant leadership on organizational commitment. Organizational culture is only a predictor of moderation.

The eight-hypothesis showed that organizational culture moderates servant leadership on organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). Individual organizations prioritize group interests, managerial decision-making will be centralized, and supervision and corporate subordinates acting interdependently will increase the power of servant leadership on OCB.

The nine-hypothesis showed organizational culture moderates servant leadership on job satisfaction—subjective moderation in careful planning, which will increase job satisfaction [12].

Organizational culture moderation has no effect on servant leadership on OCB because corporate individuals are concerned with group interests and cannot moderate. Leaders must be able to listen to others with complete sincerity and will not be able to leadership effectiveness.

The journey of implementing Otsus Papua for more than eight years has not shown the maximum results expected by all parties, giving the impression as if the central and provincial, and district/city governments and their entire staff, including the TNI and Polri apparatus, have not shown a solid commitment to consistently implement mandate of the Special Autonomy law in a practical, honest and comprehensive manner. Some central government policies are considered to deny the results of the compromise. Suppose the government and state administrators, including provinces and

districts/cities, show their sincerity in implementing the mandate of the Special Autonomy Law. In that case, there will be a significant change toward progress and improvement of the quality of life of the Papuan people in various aspects of life towards achieving an atmosphere of shared life [52]. That is safe, peaceful, prosperous, and just as mandated by the State Constitution. RI will also significantly contribute to the integration of the nation and state, which is becoming increasingly prominent.

#### 4. CONCLUSION

The results showed that servant leadership has a positive effect on the level of individual psychological empowerment, organizational commitment, OCB, and job satisfaction. Organizational culture moderates servant leadership on organizational citizenship behavior and job satisfaction. Meanwhile, servant leadership doesn't affect leadership effectiveness; organizational culture doesn't moderate servant leadership in the psychological environment, organizational commitment, and leader effectiveness. For further research, variables such as planning, rewards, gratitude, and career path need to be considered in testing organizational performance.

#### COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

#### REFERENCES

1. Beck CD. Antecedents of servant leadership: A mixed methods study. *J Leadersh Organ Stud* [Internet]. 2014;21(3):299–314. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1548051814529993>
2. Zhang Y, Zheng Y, Zhang L, Xu S, Liu X, Chen W. A meta-analytic review of the consequences of servant leadership: The moderating roles of cultural factors. *Asia Pacific J Manag*. 2021;38(1):371–400.
3. Van Dierendonck D, Stam D, Boersma P, de Windt N, Alkema J. Same difference? Exploring the differential mechanisms linking servant leadership and transformational leadership to follower outcomes. *Leadersh Q*. 2014;25(3):544–62.

4. Liden RC, Panaccio A, Meuser JD, Hu J, Wayne SJ. Servant leadership: Antecedents, processes, and outcomes. *Oxford Handb Leadersh Organ*. 2014;1–26.
5. Parris DL, Peachey JW. A systematic literature review of servant leadership theory in organizational contexts. *J Bus Ethics* [Internet]. 2013;113(3):377–93. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-012-1322-6>
6. Hsiao C, Lee Y-H, Chen W-J. The effect of servant leadership on customer value co-creation: A cross-level analysis of key mediating roles. *Tour Manag* [Internet]. 2015;49:45–57. Available: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0261517715000564>
7. Ling Q, Lin M, Wu X. The trickle-down effect of servant leadership on frontline employee service behaviors and performance: A multilevel study of Chinese hotels. *Tour Manag*. 2016;52(C):341–68.
8. Testa MR, Sipe L. Service-leadership competencies for hospitality and tourism management. *Int J Hosp Manag* [Internet]. 2012;31(3):648–58. Available: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0278431911001447>
9. Clercq D De, Bouckennooghe D, Raja U, Matsyborska G. Servant leadership and work engagement: the contingency effects of leader–follower social capital. *Hum Resour Dev Q*. 2014;25(2):183–212.
10. Cake DA, Agrawal V, Gresham G, Johansen D, Di Benedetto A. Strategic orientations, marketing capabilities and radical innovation launch success. *J Bus Ind Mark* [Internet]. 2020;35(10):1527–37. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1108/JBIM-02-2019-0068>
11. Chen Z, Zhu J, Zhou M. How does a servant leader fuel the service fire? A multilevel model of servant leadership, individual self identity, group competition climate, and customer service performance. *J Appl Psychol*. 2015;100(2):511–21.
12. Van Dierendonck D. Servant leadership: A review and synthesis. *J Manage* [Internet]. 2010;37(4):1228–61. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206310380462>
13. Hoch JE, Bommer WH, Dulebohn JH, Wu D. Do ethical, authentic, and servant leadership explain variance above and beyond transformational leadership? A Meta-Analysis. *J Manage* [Internet]. 2016;44(2):501–29. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206316665461>
14. Chan SCH, Mak W. The impact of servant leadership and subordinates' organizational tenure on trust in leader and attitudes. *Pers Rev* [Internet]. 2014;43(2):272–87. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-08-2011-0125>
15. Hu J, Liden RC. Antecedents of team potency and team effectiveness: An examination of goal and process clarity and servant leadership. *J Appl Psychol*. 2011;96(4):851–62.
16. Zhou Y, Miao Q. Servant leadership and affective commitment in the Chinese public sector: The mediating role of perceived organizational support. *Psychol Rep*. 2014;115(2):381–95.
17. Pekerti AA, Sendjaya S. Exploring servant leadership across cultures: comparative study in Australia and Indonesia. *Int J Hum Resour Manag* [Internet]. 2010;21(5):754–80. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585191003658920>
18. Han Y, Kakabadse NK, Kakabadse A. Servant leadership in the people's republic of China: A case study of the public sector. *J Manag Dev*. 2010;29(3):265–81.
19. Hu J, Judge TA. Leader-team complementarity: Exploring the interactive effects of leader personality traits and team power distance values on team processes and performance. *J Appl Psychol*. 2017;102(6):935–55.
20. Donia MBL, Raja U, Panaccio A, Wang Z. Servant leadership and employee outcomes: the moderating role of subordinates' motives. *Eur J Work Organ Psychol* [Internet]. 2016;25(5):722–34. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2016.1149471>
21. Prasetio AP, Yuniarsih T, Ahman E. Job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and organizational citizenship behaviour in state-owned banking. *Univers J Manag*. 2017;5(1):32–8.



22. Gui C, Zhang P, Zou R, Ouyang X. Servant leadership in hospitality: a meta-analytic review. *J Hosp Mark Manag* [Internet]. 2021;30(4):438–58. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1080/19368623.2021.1852641>
23. Chen C-Y, Chen C-HV, Li C-I. The influence of leader's spiritual values of servant leadership on employee motivational autonomy and eudaemonic well-being. *J Relig Health*. 2013;52(2):418–38.
24. Bedi A, Alpaslan CM, Green S. A meta-analytic review of ethical leadership outcomes and moderators. *J Bus Ethics* [Internet]. 2016;139(3):517–36. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-015-2625-1>
25. Walumbwa FO, Hartnell CA, Oke A. Servant leadership, procedural justice climate, service climate, employee attitudes, and organizational citizenship behavior: A cross-level investigation. *J Appl Psychol*. 2010;95(3):517–29.
26. Yoshida DT, Sendjaya S, Hirst G, Cooper B. Does servant leadership foster creativity and innovation? A multi-level mediation study of identification and prototypicality. *J Bus Res* [Internet]. 2014;67(7):1395–404. Available: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0148296313003111>
27. Sousa M, van Dierendonck D. Servant leadership and the effect of the interaction between humility, action, and hierarchical power on follower engagement. *J Bus Ethics* [Internet]. 2017;141(1):13–25. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-015-2725-y>
28. Ng X Le, Choi SL, Soehod K. The effects of servant leadership on employee's job withdrawal intention. *Asian Soc Sci*. 2016;12(2):99–106.
29. Dutta S, Khatri P. Servant leadership and positive organizational behaviour: the road ahead to reduce employees' turnover intentions. *Horiz*. 2017;25:60–82.
30. Avan A, Baytok A, Zorlu Ö. The effect of servant leadership on psychological empowerment and organizational identification. *J Bus Res - Turk*. 2019;11(1):293–309.
31. Greasley PE, Bocârnea MC. The relationship between personality type and the servant leadership characteristic of empowerment. *Procedia - Soc Behav Sci* [Internet]. 2014;124:11–9. Available: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1877042814020023>
32. Van Winkle B, Allen S, De Vore D, Winston B. The relationship between the servant leadership behaviors of immediate supervisors and followers' perceptions of being empowered in the context of small business. *J Leadersh Educ*. 2014; 13(3):70–82.
33. Baykal E, Zehir C, Köle M. Effects of servant leadership on gratitude, empowerment, innovativeness and performance: Turkey example. *J Econ Cult Soc*. 2018;57:29–52.
34. Akdol B, Sebnem Arikboga F. Leader member exchange as a mediator of the relationship between servant leadership and job satisfaction: A research on Turkish ICT companies. *Int J Organ Leadersh*. 2017;6(4):525–35.
35. Newman A, Donohue R, Eva N. Psychological safety: A systematic review of the literature. *Hum Resour Manag Rev*. 2017;27(3):521–535.
36. Chughtai A. Servant leadership and perceived employability: proactive career behaviours as mediators. *Leadersh Organ Dev J*. 2016;40(2):866–80.
37. Farrell MA, Oczkowski E. Organisational identification and leader member exchange influences on customer orientation and organisational citizenship behaviours. *J Strateg Mark* [Internet]. 2012;20(4):365–77. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1080/0965254X.2011.643917>
38. Michel JW, Tews MJ. Does leader-member exchange accentuate the relationship between leader behaviors and organizational citizenship behaviors? *J Leadersh Organ Stud* [Internet]. 2015;23(1):13–26. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1548051815606429>
39. Bottomley P, Mostafa AMS, Gould-Williams JS, León-Cázares F. The impact of transformational leadership on organizational citizenship behaviours: the contingent role of public service motivation. *Br J Manag*. 2016;27(2):390–405.
40. Lofquist EA, Matthiesen SB. Viking leadership: How Norwegian transformational leadership style effects

- creativity and change through organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). *Int J Cross Cult Manag* [Internet]. 2018;18(3):309–25. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1470595818806326>
41. Al-Mahdy YFH, Al-Harhi AS, El-Din NSS. Perceptions of school principals' servant leadership and their teachers' job satisfaction in Oman. *Leadersh Policy Sch*. 2016;15(4):543–66.
42. Farman S, Afridi SA, Haider M. Servant leadership and faculty loyalty nexus; mediating role of faculty trust. *NUML Int J Bus Manag Vol*. 2019;14(1):60–75.
43. Onsardi, Asmawi- M, Abdullah T. The effect of compensation, empowerment, and job satisfaction on employee loyalty. *Int J Sci Res Manag*. 2017;05(12):7590–9.
44. Frempong LN, Agbenyo W, Darko PA. The impact of job satisfaction on employees' loyalty and commitment: a comparative study among some selected sectors in Ghana agricultural credit accessibility by smallholder farmers based on logit and multimoora models view project is governance in Afric. *Eur J Bus Manag* [www.iiste.org](http://www.iiste.org) ISSN [Internet]. 2018;10(12). Available: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/325102489>
45. Naqshbandi MM, Tabche I. The interplay of leadership, absorptive capacity, and organizational learning culture in open innovation: Testing a moderated mediation model. *Technol Forecast Soc Change* [Internet]. 2018;133:156–67. Available: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0040162517307357>
46. Iqbal A, Latif KF, Ahmad MS. Servant leadership and employee innovative behaviour: exploring psychological pathways. *Leadersh Organ Dev J* [Internet]. 2020;41(6):813–27. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-11-2019-0474>
47. Khan MM, Mubarik MS, Islam T. Leading the innovation: role of trust and job crafting as sequential mediators relating servant leadership and innovative work behavior. *Eur J Innov Manag* [Internet]. 2021;24(5):1547–68. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1108/EJIM-05-2020-0187>
48. Khan MM, Mubarik MS, Islam T, Rehman A, Ahmed SS, Khan E, et al. How servant leadership triggers innovative work behavior: exploring the sequential mediating role of psychological empowerment and job crafting. *Eur J Innov Manag* [Internet]. 2022;25(4):1037–55. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1108/EJIM-09-2020-0367>
49. Cai W, Lysova EI, Khapova SN, Bossink BAG. Servant leadership and innovative work behavior in Chinese high-tech firms: A moderated mediation model of meaningful work and job autonomy. *Front Psychol*. 2018;9:1–13.
50. Carter D, Baghurst T. The influence of servant leadership on restaurant employee engagement. *J Bus Ethics* [Internet]. 2014;124(3):453–64. [cited 2022 Aug 30] Available: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/24033282>
51. Schneider SK, George WM. Servant leadership versus transformational leadership in voluntary service organizations. *Leadersh Organ Dev J*. 2011;32(1):60–77.
52. Koo H, Park C. Foundation of leadership in Asia. *Lead Charact Leadersh styles Rev Res agenda* [Internet]. 2018;35(3):697–718. Available: <http://www.scopus.com/inward/record.url?scp=85038388386&partnerID=8YFLogxK>

© 2022 Naa et al.; This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

*Peer-review history:*  
The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:  
<https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/91253>